Inseparability criteria based on matrices of moments

Adam Miranowicz,[1,2] Marco Piani,[1] Paweł Horodecki,[3] and Ryszard Horodecki[1]

[1] *Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*
[2] *Institute of Physics, Adam Mickiewicz University, 61-614 Poznań, Poland*
[3] *Faculty of Applied Physics and Mathematics, Technical University of Gdańsk, 80-952 Gdańsk, Poland*

(Dated: October 19, 2006)

Inseparability criteria for continuous and discrete bipartite quantum states based on moments of annihilation and creation operators are studied by developing the idea of Shchukin-Vogel criterion [Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 230502 (2005)]. If a state is separable, then the corresponding matrix of moments is separable too. Generalized criteria, based on the separability properties of the matrix of moments, are thus derived. In particular, a new criterion based on realignment of moments in the matrix is proposed as an analogue of the standard realignment criterion for density matrices. Other inseparability inequalities are obtained by applying positive maps to the matrix of moments. Usefulness of the Shchukin-Vogel criterion to describe bipartite-entanglement of more than two modes is demonstrated: we obtain some previously known three-mode inseparability criteria based on violation of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and we introduce new ones.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the study of continuous-variable (CV) systems from the point of view of quantum information has attracted much interest, stimulated by experimental progress (see [1, 2] and references therein). In particular, the theory of quantum entanglement for CV systems has been considerably developed, including the derivation by Shchukin and Vogel [4] of a powerful inseparability criterion of bipartite harmonic quantum states based on partial transposition (PT) [5, 6], the so-called PPT criterion. Shchukin and Vogel have demonstrated that their criterion includes, as special cases, other well-known criteria of entanglement in two-mode CV systems, including those derived by Simon [7], Duan *et al.* [8], Mancini [9], Raymer *et al.* [10], Agarwal and Biswas [11], Hillery and Zubairy [12]. Thus, the Shchukin-Vogel (SV) criterion can be considered a breakthrough result, which shows a common basis of many inseparability criteria for continuous variables (in particular, the results of Duan *et al.* [8] seemed previously to be entirely independent of partial transposition). Another advantage of the SV criterion should be noted: it is given in terms of creation-operator and annihilation-operator moments, which are measurable in standard homodyne correlation experiments [13].

Despite the evident progresses (see also [14, 15, 16, 17] and references therein), the theory of quantum entanglement for CV systems can be considered less developed than the theory for discrete, finite-dimensional systems. In the latter case, powerful inseparability criteria based on positive maps (see [18, 19] and references therein) and linear contractions [20, 21, 22, 23] (or permutations of the indices of density matrix [24]) have been studied as generalizations of the standard PPT criterion [5, 6]. Inspired by these tools available to study discrete-variable entanglement, we propose a generalization of the Shchukin-Vogel CV approach.

It must be noted that the CV setting appears to be qualitatively different from the finite-dimensional setting as regards the "abundance" of different kinds of entanglement. A state is distillable when, by local operations and classical communication, one can produce a highly entangled state, possibly acting simultaneously on many copies of the starting state. If such a transformation is not possible, the state is said to be non-distillable, and, if entangled, bound entangled. A state which is positive under partial transposition (PPT) is necessarily non-distillable [25]. While in the finite-dimensional case the volumes of the sets of separable states, PPT bound entangled states, and distillable entangled states are all non-zero [44], it has been proved that almost all states in CV are distillable [26], and, *a fortiori*, entangled. Thus, a generic state in CV is non-positive under partial transposition (NPT).

As a consequence, at a first glance, criteria to detect entanglement in CV could be considered useless and uninteresting, since almost every state is not only entangled, but moreover distillable. Such a conclusion would not be correct. Of course, we know that entanglement is an effective physical resource, i.e., something that is not available "for free". Thus, for example, if two systems have not interacted, neither directly not indirectly, in the past, they cannot be entangled, even if ("mathematically") almost all states are entangled. Moreover, a picture similar to the finite-dimensional one, i.e., with non-zero volume of sets of qualitatively different entangled states, can be recovered restricting the study to a specific, experimentally relevant, class of CV states, e.g. Gaussian states (see [2] an references therein). This is what happens also in practice: not all the CV states are physically realizable or of physical interest. Furthermore, once established that detecting CV entanglement is not an empty task, one is interested in the efficiency and reliability of different methods to achieve the goal. So, for example, even if a state could be checked to be entangled because NPT, there might be entanglement criteria that are, in some way, more efficient, and, from a practical point of view, easier to implement.

Since – in a mathematical sense – generic CV states are entangled, one is very interested in *how entangled* or *how* *far from being separable* a state is. Notice that the set of entangled states, considered as a subset of all states, is open (it is the complement of the set of separable states, which is closed by definition). Thus, around a state that is entangled, there is always a ball of entangled states. In this sense, one could say that entanglement is "robust". Of course, it is desirable to know how large the ball is: actually, this would correspond to computing a distance measure of entanglement [3]. In the specific case where the state is found entangled because it violates (within, if applicable, experimental error) some inequality, it is natural to ask for an estimate of the radius of the ball in terms of the degree of such violation. Unfortunately, to obtain such an estimate is in general not easy, especially when the inequality does not depend linearly on the state and/or the quantities entering in the inequality are not continuous in the state. Anyway, the fact that an "entangled ball" exists around the detected entangled state, stays true.

In Sect. II, we present a general idea of separability criteria based on matrices of moments. In Sect. III, we review the Shchukin-Vogel criterion. In Sects. IV and V, we present our generalizations of the SV criterion based on the separability properties of the matrix of moments of creation and annihilation operators by referring, in particular, to realignment and positive maps. A few examples illustrating the applicability of the new criteria are shown. In Sect. VI, we discuss detection of entanglement by expressing the entries of the density matrix in terms of the moments. In Sect. VII, we briefly discuss the use of the criteria to analyze bipartite-entanglement of more than two modes. Finally, we give our conclusions.

II. SEPARABILITY OF STATES AND MATRICES OF MOMENTS

Shchukin and Vogel [4] recognized a deep link between the property of positivity under the operation of PT of a two-mode density operator ρ, and the positivity under PT of the corresponding matrix of moments. In the present work, we obtain a more general relationship between the separability properties of the density operator and of the matrix of moments. Namely, we show that if a state is separable, then a suitably designed matrix of moments is separable too. This will allow us to apply all known separability criteria (not only the PPT one) to the matrix of moments rather than directly to the density matrix. For the sake of clarity, we will analyze explicitly mainly the bipartite two-mode case; anyway, the results can be extended to the multimode (see Sect. VII) and multipartite case.

Consider two modes A and B with associated annihilation and creation operators a and $a^\dagger$ for A and b and $b^\dagger$ for B. Shchukin and Vogel showed that a Hermitian operator $X = X^{AB}$ is nonnegative if and only if for any operator $f = f^{AB}$ whose normally-ordered form exists, i.e.,

$$f = \sum_{k_1,k_2,l_1,l_2=0}^{+\infty} c_{k_1k_2l_1l_2} a^{\dagger k1} a^{k_2} b^{\dagger l_1} b^{l_2}, \tag{1}$$

it holds $\langle f^\dagger f\rangle_X \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\,\{f^\dagger f X\} \geq 0$.

Let us consider the operators

$$f_i \equiv f_k^A f_l^B, \tag{2}$$

with $f_k^A \equiv a^{\dagger k_1} a^{k_2}$ and $f_l^B \equiv b^{\dagger l_1} b^{l_2}$. Here i is the unique natural number associated with a double multi-index $(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{l})$, with $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2)$, $\mathbf{l} = (l_1, l_2)$. Furthermore, the multi-indices $\mathbf{k}$ and $\mathbf{l}$ are associated with unique natural numbers $k \leftrightarrow (k_1, k_2)$ and $l \leftrightarrow (l_1, l_2)$. Any operator f whose normally form exists can thus be written as $f = \sum_i c_i f_i$. If we further define the matrix $M(X) = [M_{ij}(X)]$, whose elements are given by

$$M_{ij}(X) \equiv \langle f_i^\dagger f_j\rangle_X = \mathrm{Tr}\,\{f_i^\dagger f_j X\}, \tag{3}$$

we have

Lemma 1 *An operator X is positive semidefinite ($X \geq 0$) if and only if $M(X)$ is positive semidefinite* [4].

Indeed, X is positive semidefinite if and only if $\langle f^\dagger f\rangle_X \geq 0$ for all $f = \sum_i c_i f_i$, i.e., if and only if $\sum_{ij} c_i^* c_j M_{ij}(X) \geq 0$ for all possible $(c_i)_i = (c_1, c_2, \ldots)$. In turn, this implies that $X \geq 0$ if and only if $M(X) = [M_{ij}(X)]$ is a positive semidefinite (infinite) matrix. We will refer to correlation matrices as $M(X)$ as to the *matrices of moments*.

For any density operator ρ^{AB}, from Lemma 1 we have that the corresponding matrix of moments $M(\rho^{AB})$ is positive semidefinite. For a factorized state $\rho^{AB} = \rho^A \otimes \rho^B$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_{ij}(\rho^A \otimes \rho^B)\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{f_i^\dagger f_j \rho^A \otimes \rho^B\}\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(a^{\dagger k_1} a^{k_2})^\dagger (a^{\dagger k_1'} a^{k_2'})(b^{\dagger l_1} b^{l_2})^\dagger (b^{\dagger l_1'} b^{l_2'})\rho^A \otimes \rho^B\}\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(a^{\dagger k_1} a^{k_2})^\dagger (a^{\dagger k_1'} a^{k_2'})\rho^A\}\mathrm{Tr}\,\{(b^{\dagger l_1} b^{l_2})^\dagger (b^{\dagger l_1'} b^{l_2'})\rho^B\}\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(f_k^A)^\dagger f_{k'}^A \rho^A\}\mathrm{Tr}\,\{(f_l^B)^\dagger f_{l'}^B \rho^B\}\\
&= M_{kk'}^A(\rho^A) M_{ll'}^B(\rho^B),
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $M_{kk'}^A(\rho^A) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(f_k^A)^\dagger f_{k'}^A \rho^A\}$, so that $M^A(\rho^A) = [M_{kk'}^A(\rho^A)]$ is the matrix of moments of subsystem A in state ρ^A (and similarly for B).

A matrix of moments uniquely defines a state, i.e. if $M(\rho) = M(\sigma)$ then $\rho = \sigma$. This is immediately proven by considering that if $M(\rho) = M(\sigma)$ than $\mathrm{Tr}\,\{(\rho - \sigma) f^\dagger f\} = 0$ for all fs.

We introduce explicitly formal (infinite) bases [45] $|k\rangle \equiv |\mathbf{k}\rangle$ and $|l\rangle \equiv |\mathbf{l}\rangle$, in which we express the matrices of moments:

$$M(\rho) = \sum_{kk'll'} M_{kl,k'l'}(\rho) |k\rangle\langle k'| \otimes |l\rangle\langle l'|. \tag{5}$$

Taking into account the one-to-one correspondence between matrices of moments and states and (4), we conclude

Proposition 1 *A state is separable, $\rho = \sum_i p_i \rho_i^A \otimes \rho_i^B$, $p_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i p_i = 1$, if and only if the corresponding matrix of moments is also separable, i.e., $M(\rho) = \sum_i p_i M^A(\rho_i^A) \otimes M_i^B(\rho_i^A)$ with $M^A(\rho^A) = \sum_{kk'} M^A_{kk'}(\rho^A)|k\rangle\langle k'|$ and analogously for $M^B(\rho^B)$.*

Notice that the local matrices of moments $M^{A(B)}(\rho_i^{A(B)})$ in the Proposition are physical, i.e., can consistently be interpreted as related to a local state. Thus, one has to take into account the subtle point that a matrix of moments could be separable in terms of generic positive matrices, but not in terms of physical local matrices of moments. Such a point does not arise when studying the entanglement of a density matrix: in that case, any convex decomposition in tensor products of positive matrices is automatically a good physical separable decomposition. Therefore, it might be that no method based on the study of separability properties of matrix of moments, can distinguish all entangled states.

III. PARTIAL TRANSPOSITION AND SHCHUKIN-VOGEL CRITERION

Let us now recall the Shchukin-Vogel reasoning [4]. Let us first define the operation of partial transposition. Given a density operator

$$\rho \ = \sum_{k,l,k',l'} \rho_{kl,k'l'} |kl\rangle\langle k'l'| \tag{6}$$

in some fixed basis (say in Fock basis), where $\rho_{klk'l'} = \langle kl|\rho|k'l'\rangle$, its partial transposition (with respect to subsystem B) is

$$\rho^\Gamma \ = \sum_{k,l,k',l'} \rho_{kl,k'l'} |kl'\rangle\langle k'l|. \tag{7}$$

Partial transposition is a positive but not completely positive [46] linear map which is well defined also in an infinite-dimensional setting. Positivity of ρ^Γ is a necessary condition for separability of ρ [5, 6]. We rederive explicitly the relation between the matrix of moments of ρ and the one of the partially-transposed state ρ^Γ:

$$\begin{aligned}
&M_{kl,k'l'}(\rho^\Gamma)\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(a^{\dagger k_1}a^{k_2})^\dagger (a^{\dagger k_1'}a^{k_2'})(b^{\dagger l_1}b^{l_2})^\dagger (b^{\dagger l_1'}b^{l_2'})\rho^\Gamma\}\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(a^{\dagger k_1}a^{k_2})^\dagger (a^{\dagger k_1'}a^{k_2'})\big((b^{\dagger l_1}b^{l_2})^\dagger (b^{\dagger l_1'}b^{l_2'})\big)^T\rho\}\\
&= \mathrm{Tr}\,\{(a^{\dagger k_1}a^{k_2})^\dagger (a^{\dagger k_1'}a^{k_2'})(b^{\dagger l_1'}b^{l_2'})^\dagger (b^{\dagger l_1}b^{l_2})\rho\}\\
&= M_{kl',k'l}(\rho),
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

following from the property $b^T = b^\dagger$. Therefore, the matrix of moments of the partially-transposed state corresponds to the partial transpositions of the matrix of moments of the state. Moreover, considering Lemma 1, we have:

Criterion 1 *(***Shchukin-Vogel** [4]*) A bipartite quantum state ρ is NPT if and only if $M(\rho^\Gamma) = (M(\rho))^\Gamma$ is NPT.*

Considering the remarks following Proposition 1 it is noteworthy that analyzing the partial transposition of the matrix of moments we are able to conclude about the PPT/NPT property of the states. In particular, this means that the only possible entangled states, for which the analysis of the separability properties of the corresponding matrix of moments is not enough to reveal their entanglement, are PPT bound entangled states.

Given Criterion 1, there is still the problem of analyzing the positivity of $(M(\rho))^\Gamma$. Since the matrix of moments is infinite, one necessarily focuses on submatrices. Let us define $M_N(\rho^\Gamma)$ to be the submatrix corresponding to the first N rows and columns of $M(\rho^\Gamma)$. According to the original work by Shchukin and Vogel [4], a bipartite quantum state would be NPT if and only if there exists an N such that $\det M_N(\rho^\Gamma) < 0$. As shown in [27], this is not correct, since the sign of all leading principal minors, i.e., of $\det M_N(\rho^\Gamma)$, for all $N \geq 1$, does not characterize completely the (semi)positivity of matrices of moments which are singular. For any (possibly infinite) matrix $\mathcal{M}$, let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{r}}$, $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \ldots, r_N)$ denote the $N \times N$ principal submatrix which is obtained by deleting all rows and columns except the ones labelled by $r_1, \ldots, r_N$. By applying Sylvester's criterion (see, e.g., [28]) we find [27]:

Criterion 2 *A bipartite state ρ is NPT if and only if there exists a negative principal minor, i.e., $\det(M(\rho^\Gamma))_{\mathbf{r}} < 0$ for some $\mathbf{r} \equiv (r_1, \ldots, r_N)$ with $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 < \ldots < r_N$.*

Focusing on the principal submatrix $(M(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}}$, is equivalent to considering a matrix given by moments $M_{ij}(\rho) = \mathrm{Tr}\,\{f_i^\dagger f_j \rho\}$ only for some specific operators f_i. In turn, this amounts to study positivity of ρ (or ρ^Γ, when we consider $(M(\rho^\Gamma))_{\mathbf{r}}$) only with respect to a subclass of operators $f^\dagger f$ (see the proof of Lemma 1), i.e., with $f = \sum_{i=1}^N c_{r_i} f_{r_i}$. Hereafter, if not otherwise specified, we slightly abuse notation and denote by $f = (f_{r_1}, f_{r_2}, ..., f_{r_N})$ a subclass of the class of operators (2). Let $M_f(\rho^\Gamma) \equiv (M(\rho^\Gamma))_{\mathbf{r}}$ with $f = (f_{r_1}, f_{r_2}, ..., f_{r_N})$ denote the principal submatrix corresponding to $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_N)$. Criterion 2 can then equivalently be rewritten as:

Criterion 3 *A bipartite state ρ is NPT if and only if there exists f such that $\det M_f(\rho^\Gamma)$ is negative.*

More compactly:

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho \text{ is PPT } &\Leftrightarrow \ \forall f: \quad \det M_f(\rho^\Gamma) \geq 0,\\
\rho \text{ is NPT } &\Leftrightarrow \ \exists f: \quad \det M_f(\rho^\Gamma) < 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Notice that in general $M_f(\rho^\Gamma) \neq (M_f(\rho))^\Gamma$, i.e., the operation of partial transposition and the choice of a principal submatrix do not commute. The criterion requires to consider submatrices of the partially-transposed matrix of moments, i.e., $M_f(\rho^\Gamma)$, not to take submatrices of the matrix of moments and study their partial transposition. On the other hand, for any f (i.e., for any $\mathbf{r}$), the moments which constitute the entries of $M_f(\rho^\Gamma)$ and $M_f(\rho)$, when both expressed with respect to ρ, are simply related by Hermitian conjugation of the mode b.

IV. NEW INSEPARABILITY CRITERIA VIA REORDERING OF MATRICES OF MOMENTS

In this Section, we will be interested in studying the separability properties of the matrix of moments through a reordering of its elements. Indeed, apart from partial transposition, there are other entanglement criteria based on such reorderings. In the bipartite setting, the only non-trivial one which is also independent of partial transposition is realignment. For a state ρ as in (6), realignment reads

$$\rho^R = \sum_{k,l,k',l'} \rho_{kl,k'l'} |kk'\rangle\langle ll'|. \tag{10}$$

In a finite-dimensional setting, necessary conditions for separability can be formulated as $||\rho^\Gamma|| \leq 1$ [5] and $||\rho^R|| \leq 1$ [20, 21], where $||A|| = \mathrm{Tr}\{\sqrt{A^\dagger A}\}$ is the trace norm of A. The converse statements, $||\rho^\Gamma|| > 1$ and $||\rho^R|| > 1$, are therefore sufficient conditions for the state to be entangled. It is worth noting that $||\rho^\Gamma|| \leq 1$, contrary to the realignment criterion, is also a sufficient condition for separability for 2×2 and 2×3 systems [6].

We have seen how the partial transposition of the matrix of moments corresponds to the matrix of moments of the partially-transposed state, leading to the SV criterion. It is immediate to define a realigned matrix of moments following (10). Unfortunately, there is no simple relation between the realigned matrix of moments and the realigned state. More importantly, partial transposition and realignment, while both corresponding to a reordering of the elements of a matrix, appear to be on a different footing as regards their applicability in an infinite-dimensional setting. Indeed, the partial transposition criterion can be stated as a condition on positivity of the partially-transposed state/matrix of moments, besides a condition on the corresponding trace norm. On the other hand, the realignment condition can be expressed only in the latter way, so that it is not suited to study the separability properties of a non-normalized (and non-normalizable) infinite matrix, e.g in the case of the matrix of moments. To circumvent such an issue, in the following we will analyze separability properties of properly truncated matrix of moments, opening the possibility to deploy the power of the techniques developed for finite-dimensional systems. We remark that such a "truncation approach" could also be applied directly to CV density matrices, as it was done, for example, in [16], but in this work we focus on the matrices of moments. One of the main reasons is that, as already remarked about SV criterion, moments are measurable in standard homodyne correlation experiments.

In the SV approach, one typically refers directly to the total infinite matrix of moments $M(\rho^\Gamma)$ (see Criterion 1), studying positivity of its principal minors (see Criterion 2). Instead, we propose to first truncate the matrix of moments $M(\rho)$, and then analyze with different criteria the separability of the truncated matrix of moments. Indeed, truncation is equivalent to focusing on (some) submatrix. The submatrix must be chosen correctly, avoiding the introduction of artifact entanglement by the truncation. The truncated matrix is positive and, once normalized, can be considered a legitimate state of an effective bi- or multi-partite finite-dimensional system. Explicitly, consider subsets of indices

$$\begin{aligned} I_A &= \{k^{(1)}, \ldots, k^{(d_A)}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{k}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{k}^{(d_A)}\}, \\ I_B &= \{l^{(1)}, \ldots, l^{(d_B)}\} \leftrightarrow \{\mathbf{l}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{l}^{(d_B)}\} \end{aligned}$$

and the corresponding projectors $P_A = \sum_{k \in I_A} |k\rangle\langle k|$ and $P_B = \sum_{l \in I_B} |l\rangle\langle l|$. Then we can define a finite-dimensional matrix

$$M_{I_A I_B}(\rho) = \big(P_A \otimes P_B\big) M(\rho) \big(P_A \otimes P_B\big) \tag{11}$$

and we have that $M_{I_A I_B}(\rho)/\mathrm{Tr}\{M_{I_A I_B}(\rho)\}$ is a well-defined state (positive and with trace equal to one) for a $d_A \otimes d_B$ system, which is separable if the starting state ρ is separable. Indeed, according to Proposition 1, if ρ is separable then $M(\rho)$ is separable too; moreover, a further local projection cannot induce the creation of entanglement.

As we noted at the end of Section III, any choice of a principal submatrix can be described as considering a specific class f of operators, i.e., a restricted set of products of annihilation and creation operators in normal order. Now, we are interested in the classes of operators corresponding to the choice of I_A and I_B. This means we will always consider only tensor product classes of operators:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f} &= f^A \otimes f^B \\ &= (a^{\dagger k_1^{(1)}} a^{k_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, a^{\dagger k_1^{(d_A)}} a^{k_2^{(d_A)}}) \\ &\quad \otimes (b^{\dagger l_1^{(1)}} b^{l_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, b^{\dagger l_1^{(d_B)}} b^{l_2^{(d_B)}}) \\ &= (a^{\dagger k_1^{(1)}} a^{k_2^{(1)}} b^{\dagger l_1^{(1)}} b^{l_2^{(1)}}, \ldots). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

With the help of this notation, a truncated matrix of moments will be denoted in the following as

$$M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) \equiv \sum_{\substack{k,k' \in I_A \\ l,l' \in I_B}} M_{kl,k'l'}(\rho) |kl\rangle\langle k'l'| \tag{13}$$

for an operator class $\tilde{f}$, which is given by a tensor product of classes (as marked by tilde).

Elements of matrix (13) can be reordered to get entanglement criteria in full analogy to those based on reordering of the density matrix elements. Thus, we formally apply to $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$ the "partial transposition"

$$(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{\Gamma} = \sum_{k,l,k',l'} M_{klk'l'}(\rho)|k'l\rangle\langle kl'|, \tag{14}$$

and the "realignment"

$$(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{R} = \sum_{k,l,k',l'} M_{klk'l'}(\rho)|kk'\rangle\langle ll'|, \tag{15}$$

in complete analogy to (7) and (10). Let us define the normalized trace norms

$$\nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) \equiv \frac{||(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{\Gamma}||}{\mathrm{Tr}\,\{M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)\}}, \quad \nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) \equiv \frac{||(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{R}||}{\mathrm{Tr}\,\{M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)\}}. \tag{16}$$

It is worth noting that, because of the tensor product structure of $\tilde{f}$, we have

$$(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{\Gamma} = M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma}) \tag{17}$$

for all $\tilde{f}$ and all ρ.

The SV criterion can now be equivalently formulated as

Criterion 4 *A bipartite state ρ is NPT if and only if there exists a tensor product class $\tilde{f}$, given by (12), such that $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma})$ is not positive or, equivalently, $\nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) > 1$.*

The Rudolph-Chen-Wu [20, 21] realignment criterion for density matrices, can be generalized straightforwardly for the matrices of moments as follows:

Criterion 5 *A bipartite quantum state ρ is inseparable if there exists $\tilde{f}$, such that $(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{R}$ has trace norm $||(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{R}||$ greater than $\mathrm{Tr}\,\{M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)\}$.*

More compactly:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho \text{ is separable } &\Rightarrow \forall \tilde{f}: \quad \nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) \le 1, \\ \rho \text{ is inseparable } &\Leftarrow \exists \tilde{f}: \quad \nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) > 1. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

In principle, the criterion (18) based on the realignment of the matrix of moments is inequivalent to the SV criterion based on PT, similarly as, for finite-dimensional density matrices, the Peres-Horodecki criterion is not equivalent to the Rudolph-Chen-Wu criterion. This means that there could be states detected by partial transposition, i.e., by the SV criterion, but not by Criterion 5, and others such that the opposite happens, i.e., PPT states that are obviously not detected the PT-based SV criterion, but are detected by (18). Moreover, an important difference in *efficiency* could arise even in the case both criteria are able to detect a given entangled state ρ. First, note that the two criteria could reveal entanglement by considering different submatrices, i.e., it could be $\nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}} > 1, \nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}} \le 1$ and $\nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}'} \le 1, \nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}'} > 1$, for $\tilde{f} \neq \tilde{f}'$. Second, one criterion could be able to tell us that the state is entangled by considering a smaller number of moments. That is, an inequality related to, let us say, the realignment-based criterion, could be violated for a submatrix of moments much smaller than the one required to detect the entanglement by means of partial transposition.

Unfortunately, for the time being, we are unable to provide a proof of such inequivalence, more precisely, not even an example of a state the matrix of moments of which has $\nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}} > 1$ and $\nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}} \le 1$, for a given $\tilde{f}$.

A question arises on the sensitivity of a norm-based criterion dependence on the choice of the norm. For example, can we increase the sensitivity of the criterion with a proper choice of the parameter p in the p-norm defined by $||A||_p = (\mathrm{Tr}\,\{|A|^p\})^{1/p}$? Clearly $||A||_1 = ||A||$. Unfortunately, we cannot get a stronger criterion by using p-norms for $p > 1$ because of the following relation: if $p' \ge p$ then $||A||_{p'} \le ||A||_p$ (see, e.g., [29]).

Another question about optimization of the entanglement criteria arises. The problem can be formulated as follows: Find the simplest submatrix $M_f(\rho^{\Gamma})$ to detect entanglement of a given state. In particular, we find that the optimized f and $\tilde{f}$ for the Bell state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$ are more complicated than those for the Bell singlet (-) and one of the triplet (+) states $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)$. We have found the fs and $\tilde{f}$s, which appear to be the simplest for the examples discussed in this section. On the other hand, fs which detect entanglement of more complicated higher-dimensional mixed states can be chosen by a numerical optimization method.

A. Exemplary applications of partial transposition and realignment

Let us give a few examples of application of the inseparability criteria based on PT and realignment of matrices of moments. We recall that $(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{\Gamma} = M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma})$ for a tensor-product $\tilde{f}$.

Example 1. To detect the entanglement of the singlet state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$, one can choose $\tilde{f} = (1, a) \otimes (1, b) \equiv (1, a, b, ab)$ yielding the following matrix of moments $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) \equiv [M_{ij}] = [\langle \tilde{f}_i^{\dagger} \tilde{f}_j \rangle]$:

$$M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \langle a \rangle & \langle b \rangle & \langle ab \rangle \\ \langle a^{\dagger} \rangle & \langle N_a \rangle & \langle a^{\dagger} b \rangle & \langle N_a b \rangle \\ \langle b^{\dagger} \rangle & \langle a b^{\dagger} \rangle & \langle N_b \rangle & \langle a N_b \rangle \\ \langle a^{\dagger} b^{\dagger} \rangle & \langle N_a b^{\dagger} \rangle & \langle a^{\dagger} N_b \rangle & \langle N_a N_b \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \tag{19}$$

where $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$, and $N_a = a^{\dagger} a$, $N_b = b^{\dagger} b$ are the number operators. The only nonzero terms of (19) for the singlet state are: $M_{11} = 1$, $M_{22} = M_{33} = -M_{23} = -M_{32} = 1/2$. Elements of $[M_{ij}]$ can be reordered, according to (14) and (15), to get $(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{\Gamma}$ and $(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))^{R}$

equal to

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{21} & M_{13} & M_{23} \\ M_{12} & M_{22} & M_{14} & M_{24} \\ M_{31} & M_{41} & M_{33} & M_{43} \\ M_{32} & M_{42} & M_{34} & M_{44} \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & M_{21} & M_{22} \\ M_{13} & M_{14} & M_{23} & M_{24} \\ M_{31} & M_{32} & M_{41} & M_{42} \\ M_{33} & M_{34} & M_{43} & M_{44} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

respectively. Thus, for the singlet state one gets the trace norms, defined by (16), greater than 1, i.e., $\nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}} = \nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}} = (1+\sqrt{2})/2$, as well as negative $\det M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma}) = -1/16$ and $\min \mathrm{eig} M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma}) = (1-\sqrt{2})/2$. It is seen that both the PT and realignment based criteria detect the entanglement of the singlet state. It is worth noting that one could analyze just the submatrix of the first matrix of (20) corresponding to $\mathbf{r} = (1,4)$. This amounts to considering, in the standard SV approach, $M_f(\rho^{\Gamma})$ with $f = (1, ab)$. Then one gets

$$M_f(\rho^{\Gamma}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \langle ab^{\dagger}\rangle \\ \langle a^{\dagger}b\rangle & \langle N_a N_b\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \tag{21}$$

from which the Hillery-Zubairy criterion of entanglement follows [12]:

$$\det M_f(\rho^{\Gamma}) = \langle N_a N_b\rangle - |\langle ab^{\dagger}\rangle|^2 < 0. \tag{22}$$

For our state, one gets $M_f(\rho^{\Gamma}) = [1, -1/2; -1/2, 0]$, which results in $\det M_f(\rho^{\Gamma}) = -1/4$.

Example 2. The realignment-based and PT-based criteria can also detect the entanglement of partially-entangled states. To show this, let us analyze the state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle)$ for which negativity is equal to 2/3. By choosing $\tilde{f}$ the same as in Example 1, one gets

$$M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) = \frac{1}{3}\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{23}$$

which implies $\nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}} = \nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}} = 1.1891 > 1$ (as well as $\det M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma}) = -1/81 < 0$). Thus, the entanglement of the state can be detected by both criteria. As in Example 1, we can use the submatrix of moments $M_f(\rho^{\Gamma}) = [1, 1/3; 1/3, 0]$, given by (21) (or, which is the same, the submatrix $(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma}))_{\mathbf{r}}$ of the partially-transposed $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$ of (23), for $\mathbf{r} = (1,4)$), which also has negative determinant (equal to $-1/9$) and minimum eigenvalue, given by $(3-\sqrt{13})/6 \approx -0.1$.

Example 3. The realignment-based criterion is sensitive also for some infinite-dimensional entangled states, as can be shown on the example of superpositions of coherent states, referred to as the two-mode Schrödinger cat states,

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi'\rangle &= \mathcal{N}'(|\alpha, -\beta\rangle - |-\alpha, \beta\rangle), \\ |\psi''\rangle &= \mathcal{N}''(|\alpha, \beta\rangle - |-\alpha, -\beta\rangle), \end{aligned}$$

which are normalized by functions $\mathcal{N}'$ and $\mathcal{N}''$ of the complex amplitudes α and β. As actually shown in [4], the entanglement of $|\psi''\rangle$ (but also of $|\psi'\rangle$) can be detected by the standard SV criterion for $f = (1, b, ab)$, for which one gets a negative determinant $\det M_f(\rho^{\Gamma})$. The realignment-based criterion applied to the factorized $\tilde{f} = (1, a) \otimes (1, b)$ is also sensitive enough to detect entanglement of both states $|\psi'\rangle$ and $|\psi''\rangle$. E.g., for both states with $\alpha = 0.3$ and $\beta = 0.2$, one gets the trace norms for realignment and PT greater than one, i.e., $\nu^{R}_{\tilde{f}} = 1.1666$ and $\nu^{\Gamma}_{\tilde{f}} = 1.1783$. Note again that by analyzing determinant or minimum eigenvalue of submatrix $(M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho^{\Gamma}))_{\mathbf{r}}$ for $\mathbf{r} = (1,4)$, given by (21), one can detect entanglement of the state by handling less moments.

V. POSITIVE MAPS ACTING ON MATRICES OF MOMENTS

In this section we generalize the SV criterion by applying the theory of positive maps (see reviews [18, 19]).

The criterion of separability for states which is based on positive maps, says the following [5, 6]: a bipartite state ρ is separable if and only if every positive linear map Λ acting partially (say on the second subsystem only) transforms ρ into a new matrix with nonnegative spectrum, i.e.,

$$(\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \Lambda_B)[\rho^{AB}] \geq 0. \tag{24}$$

(For brevity, the system-identifying superscripts are usually omitted). Therefore, if the partial action of a positive map on a state of a composite system spoils the positivity of the state, then the state must be entangled. Obviously, the Peres-Horodecki PPT criterion can be formulated as (24), with $\Lambda = T$ being the transposition operation. On the other hand, we note that realignment is not a positive map, and the related criterion involves the evaluation of the trace norm of the realigned state, which is in general not even Hermitian.

The separability criterion based on positive maps can be applied in the space of matrices of moments to conclude that the starting state is entangled. Indeed, the reasoning at the base of the partial map criterion does not require any normalization and regards only the property of positivity. More explicitly:

Criterion 6 *Let Λ be a linear map preserving positivity of (infinite) matrices, and let $M(\rho)$ be a separable matrix of moments, i.e., $M(\rho) = \sum_n p_n M_n(\rho^A) \otimes M_n(\rho^B)$ with $p_n \geq 0$. Then the (infinite) matrix resulting from the partial action of Λ, i.e., $(\mathrm{id} \otimes \Lambda)[M(\rho)] = \sum_n p_n M_n(\rho^A) \otimes \Lambda[M_n(\rho^B)]$, is also positive.*

Therefore, if we are given a matrix of moments $M(\rho)$ for two modes and a positive map Λ and we find that $(\mathrm{id} \otimes \Lambda)[M(\rho)]$ is not positive, then we conclude that the matrix of moments as well as the starting state are not separable.

If there were a mapping between positive linear maps on states and positive linear maps on the corresponding matrices of moments, we could perhaps derive a general theorem of the Shchukin-Vogel type. Unfortunately such a connection, if existing at all, does not seem to be immediate. Transposition appears in this sense to be very special, since transposition of states translates simply into transposition of matrices of moments. We will apply partial maps to truncated matrices of moments, so that we have the following:

Criterion 7 *If, for some $\tilde{f}$, there is a positive linear map Λ such that $(\mathrm{id}\otimes\Lambda)[M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)]$ is not positive, then ρ is entangled.*

We remark that, since in the case of PT the result of the application of the partial map to the total, infinite matrix of moments $M(\rho)$ is known, it is sufficient to consider submatrices directly after the application of PT, i.e., to consider $M_f(\rho^\Gamma)$. In this case, there is no need to consider submatrices before the application of PT. On the other hand, in general, we may consider maps which act on finite dimensions: consequently, we have to first take (properly chosen) submatrices $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$, and only then act partially on them to obtain $M'_{\tilde{f}} = (\mathrm{id}\otimes\Lambda)[M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)]$. This does not exclude that, after the action of the map, we may focus on an even smaller submatrix $(M'_{\tilde{f}})_{\mathbf{r}}$ of the partially-transformed submatrix of moments, to study its positivity.

For example, one can apply non-decomposable [47] maps to try to detect the entanglement of PPT entangled states. Classes of such maps were constructed for arbitrary finite dimension $N \geq 3$, e.g., by Kossakowski [30], Ha [31], and recently by Breuer [32] and Hall [33].

We are not able to provide examples of PPT bound entangled states, the entanglement of which is detected by applying positive maps on submatrices of moments. Anyway, we stress that it may happen that a detection method based on an indecomposable map is able to detect more efficiently the entanglement of an NPT state than PT itself, e.g. it may be sufficient to consider smaller submatrices of moments.

A related quite interesting question is about the sensitivity of both the PPT and non-decomposable map criteria in the case, where *the same* submatrix of moments is considered. It may happen that even in that case non-decomposable map may provide a criterion which on some NPT state is stronger (in terms of absolute value of the negative eigenvalues) violated than the PPT one. But this questions need further investigation.

It is worth noting that the proposed method enables a simple derivation of various inseparability inequalities, to mention

$$(1+\langle N_a^2\rangle)(\langle N_aN_b\rangle+\langle N_a^2N_b\rangle) < |\langle a^\dagger b\rangle|^2, \tag{25}$$

$$2(\langle N_aN_b\rangle+\langle N_a^2N_b\rangle) < |\langle N_a b\rangle - \langle a^\dagger b\rangle|^2, \tag{26}$$

which correspond, respectively, to the conditions on the determinant of (30) and (38) obtained in the next subsection.

A. Exemplary applications of positive maps

The proposed method can be summarized as follows: First truncate the matrix of moments, i.e., $M \to M_{\tilde{f}}$, then apply a positive map, i.e., $M_{\tilde{f}} \to M'_{\tilde{f}}$, and check the positivity of the partially-transformed submatrix of moments $M'_{\tilde{f}}$. In turn, this amounts to considering positivity of submatrices $(M'_{\tilde{f}})_{\mathbf{r}}$, or, by virtue of Sylvester's criterion, to checking positivity of determinants $\det(M'_{\tilde{f}})_{\mathbf{r}}$. Thus, one can say that submatrices of partially transformed submatrices are considered.

Here, we give a few examples of application of our inseparability criteria based on some specific classes of positive maps applied to matrices of moments.

1. Kossakowski and Choi maps

The Kossakowski class of positive maps transforms matrices $A = [A_{ij}]_{N\times N}$ in $\mathcal{C}^N$ onto matrices in the same space as follows [30]

$$\Lambda_K[A] = \frac{\mathbb{1}}{N}\mathrm{Tr}A + \frac{1}{N-1}g\cdot(Rx+\kappa y\mathrm{Tr}A), \tag{27}$$

where '$\cdot$' stands for the scalar product, $\kappa=\sqrt{(N-1)/N}$, $x=(x_i)_i$, $x_i = \mathrm{Tr}\,\{Ag_i\}$, and $g=(g_i)_i$ satisfying $g_i=g_i^*$, $\mathrm{Tr}\,\{g_ig_j\}=\delta_{ij}$, $\mathrm{Tr}\,\{g_i\}=0$ for $i,j=1,...,N^2-1$. In our applications, we assume $y=0$, R to be rotations $R(\theta)\in\mathrm{SO}(N^2-1)$, and g_i to be generators of $\mathrm{SU}(N)$. Note that the Ha maps [31] do not belong to (27). In a special case for $A=[A_{ij}]_{3\times3}$, the Kossakowski map is reduced to the Choi map [39],

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda_{\mathrm{Choi}}[A] = -A + \mathrm{diag}([&\alpha A_{11}+\beta A_{22}+\gamma A_{33},\\ &\gamma A_{11}+\alpha A_{22}+\beta A_{33},\\ &\beta A_{11}+\gamma A_{22}+\alpha A_{33}]),\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

which is positive if and only if $\alpha\geq1$, $\alpha+\beta+\gamma\geq3$ and $1\leq\alpha\leq2\Rightarrow\beta\gamma\geq(2-\alpha)^2$, while decomposable if and only if $\alpha\geq1$ and $1\leq\alpha\leq3\Rightarrow\beta\gamma\geq(3-\alpha)^2/4$. We denote the resulting (unnormalized) matrix of moments shortly as

$$M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)\equiv(\mathrm{id}\otimes\Lambda_{\mathrm{Choi}})[M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)]. \tag{29}$$

It is worth noting that some bound entangled states can be detected [22] by applying to ρ the Störmer map [42], which is a special case of the Choi map for $\alpha=2,\beta=0,\gamma=1$ and of (27) for $\theta=\pi/3$ and $N=3$.

Example 1. As an exemplary application of a positive map to a matrix of moments, let us analyze the singlet state $|\psi\rangle=\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle-|10\rangle)$. Its entanglement can be detected by choosing $\tilde{f}=(1,a,N_a)\otimes(1,b,N_b)$ and by applying our criterion based on the Choi map with $\alpha=\beta=\gamma=1$. Note that the chosen map is decomposable [48], but anyway useful for the detection of the NPT entanglement. This results in a 9×9 matrix of moments $M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$ with only the following nonzero elements: $M'_{11} = 1$, $M'_{22} = M'_{33} = 3/2$, $-M'_{13} = M'_{24} = M'_{28} = M'_{39} = M'_{ii} = 1/2$ for $i = 5,6,8,9$ and other terms given by $M'_{kl} = M'_{lk}$. Clearly, the state is entangled as $\det M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) = -1/16$. To reveal the entanglement, it is sufficient to analyze submatrix $(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}}$ with $\mathbf{r} = (2,4,6,8)$ having the same negative eigenvalue as for $M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$, or even 2×2 submatrix $(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}}$ for $\mathbf{r} = (2,4)$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} + M_{33} & -M_{24} \\ -M_{42} & M_{55} + M_{66} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \langle N_a^2 \rangle, & -\langle a^\dagger b \rangle \\ -\langle a^\dagger b \rangle^*, & \langle N_a N_b \rangle + \langle N_a^2 N_b \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (30)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $M_{ij} = \langle \tilde{f}_i^\dagger \tilde{f}_j \rangle$ are elements of the original (not-transformed) matrix of moments, $M_{\tilde{f}}(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|)$. Matrix (30) for the singlet state is given by $[3/2, 1/2; 1/2, 0]$ with negative determinant (equal to -1/4). The entanglement of the partially entangled state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle)$ can also be detected by (30), which is now reduced to $(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{3}[4, -1; -1, 0]$ yielding negative values of $\min \operatorname{eig}(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = (2 - \sqrt{5})/3 \approx -0.08$ and $\det(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = -1/9$.

Example 2. To detect the entanglement of $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ one can choose the same $\tilde{f}$ as in the former example to apply the map, and after the application of the map it is sufficient to consider the submatrix $(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}}$ corresponding to $\mathbf{r} = (1,5,7)$. Thus, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} &= \begin{bmatrix} M_{22} + M_{33} & -M_{15} & M_{28} + M_{39} \\ -M_{15}^* & M_{44} + M_{66} & -M_{57} \\ M_{28}^* + M_{39}^* & -M_{57}^* & M_{88} + M_{99} \end{bmatrix} \\
&= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\frac{1}{2} & 1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (31)
\end{aligned}
$$

having determinant equal to -1/4, which reveals entanglement of the state.

2. *Breuer map*

Our inseparability criterion for matrices of moments can also be based on the Breuer positive map defined in a space of even dimension $d \geq 4$ as follows [32]:

$$
\Lambda_{\text{Breuer}}[A] = \mathbb{1}\operatorname{Tr} A - A - \vartheta[A], \quad (32)
$$

where $\vartheta[A] = UA^T U^\dagger$ can be interpreted as a time reversal transformation and is given by a skew-symmetric unitary matrix U. The latter can be constructed explicitly as $U = RDR^T$ in terms of [33]:

$$
D = \sum_{k=0}^{d/2-1} e^{i\phi_k} (|2k\rangle\langle 2k+1| - |2k+1\rangle\langle 2k|). \quad (33)
$$

for any angles ϕ_k and arbitrary orthogonal matrix R. Although antisymmetric unitary matrices exist only in even-dimensional spaces, the Breuer map can be generalized for arbitrary dimensions (see, e.g., [33]). The Breuer map leads to a powerful and computationally simple inseparability criterion for density matrices [32, 33]. Thus, it is tempting to propose an analogous criterion by applying the Breuer map to a matrix of moments:

$$
M''_{\tilde{f}}(\rho) \equiv (\mathrm{id} \otimes \Lambda_{\text{Breuer}})[M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)] \quad (34)
$$

and checking positivity of the transformed matrix $M''_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$.

Example 1. To reveal entanglement of the singlet state, let us first analyze a matrix $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$ of moments generated by some 16-element $\tilde{f}$. Antisymmetric unitary matrix U can, for example, be constructed as the anti-diagonal matrix

$$
U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (35)
$$

Then, by applying the corresponding Breuer map, one can easily get, from (34), the transformed 16×16 matrix $M''_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$ for arbitrary state ρ. This matrix reveals, for example, entanglement of the singlet state for various choices of $\tilde{f}$, e.g.: $\tilde{f}^{(1)} = (1, a, N_a, a^2) \otimes (1, b, N_b, b^2)$, $\tilde{f}^{(2)} = (1, a, N_a, 1) \otimes (1, b, N_b, 1)$, or even $\tilde{f}^{(3)} = (1, a, 1, 1) \otimes (1, b, 1, 1)$.

Note that $\tilde{f}^{(2)}$ and $\tilde{f}^{(3)}$ do not provide more information than $(1, a, N_a) \otimes (1, b, N_b)$ and $(1, a) \otimes (1, b)$, respectively. The matrices of moments corresponding to the former sets of operators contain redundant copies of the moments related to the latter sets, i.e., a repetition of an operator amounts to have a matrix of moments with repeated columns and rows. We considered such redundant sets of operators because Breuer criterion requires one of the subsystems to be at least 4-dimensional, but at the same time we wanted to emphasize that is possible to detect (by means of Breuer's map) entanglement with fewer and fewer combinations of "independent" operators. We point out that $\tilde{f}^{(1)}$ provides for sure more information in general than $\tilde{f}^{(2)}$, and in turn the latter more than $\tilde{f}^{(3)}$.

The entanglement detection can be much simplified by analyzing the submatrix of $M''_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$ corresponding, e.g., to $\mathbf{r} = (2,5)$:

$$
(M''_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} M_{11} + M_{44} & -M_{25} - M_{47} \\ -M_{25}^* - M_{47}^* & M_{66} + M_{77} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)
$$

where, as usual, $M_{ij} = \langle \tilde{f}_i^\dagger \tilde{f}_j \rangle$ are elements of the original matrix $M_{\tilde{f}}(\rho)$. For $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^{(1)}$, matrix (36) reduces to

$$
(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(1)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \langle a^{\dagger 2} a^2 \rangle & -\langle a^\dagger b \rangle - \langle a^{\dagger 3} ab \rangle \\ -\langle a^\dagger b \rangle^* - \langle a^{\dagger 3} ab \rangle^* & \langle (1 + N_a) N_a N_b \rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (37)
$$

For the example of the singlet state, one gets $(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(1)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = [1, 1/2; 1/2, 0]$, for which determinant is $-1/4$. One can get even simpler criterion from (36) by choosing $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^{(2)}$:

$$(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(2)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & \langle N_a b\rangle - \langle a^\dagger b\rangle \\ \langle N_a b^\dagger\rangle - \langle ab^\dagger\rangle & \langle N_a N_b\rangle + \langle N_a^2 N_b\rangle \end{bmatrix}. \quad (38)$$

Explicitly, for the singlet state, we have $\det(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(2)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \det[2, 1/2; 1/2, 0] = -1/4$. By contrast to $\tilde{f}^{(1)}$ and $\tilde{f}^{(2)}$, matrix (36) for $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^{(3)}$ is positive. Nevertheless entanglement can be revealed by choosing a larger submatrix of $M''_{\tilde{f}^{(3)}}(\rho)$ corresponding to $\mathbf{r} = (2, 5, 7, 8)$, which results in

$$(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(3)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & x_- & 0 & x_+ \\ x_-^* & z & y_+^* & 0 \\ 0 & y_+ & 2\langle N_b\rangle & y_- \\ x_+^* & 0 & y_-^* & z \end{bmatrix}, \quad (39)$$

where $x_\pm = \pm\langle b\rangle - \langle a^\dagger b\rangle$, $y_\pm = \pm\langle aN_b\rangle - \langle N_b\rangle$, and $z = \langle (N_a + 1)N_b\rangle$. For the singlet state, one again gets $\det(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(3)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = -1/4$.

It is not surprising that one has to change submatrix (i.e. (39) instead of (36)), because for $\tilde{f}^{(3)}$ less entries of the matrix $M_f(\rho)$ contain independent information (actually, only a 4×4 matrix (corresponding to $(1, a)\otimes(1, b)$) out of the larger 16×16 matrix (all the other entries are just repetitions)).

Example 2. To reveal the entanglement of the Bell state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$, one can apply $\tilde{f} = \tilde{f}^{(1)}$ or $\tilde{f}^{(2)}$ and the Breuer map to be the same as in the former example. Here, one can choose submatrix $(M''_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}}$ corresponding to $\mathbf{r} = (1, 6, 9)$, which reads as:

$$\begin{bmatrix} M_{2,2} + M_{3,3} & -M_{1,6} - M_{3,8} & M_{2,10} + M_{3,11} \\ -M_{6,1} - M_{8,3} & M_{5,5} + M_{8,8} & -M_{6,9} - M_{8,11} \\ M_{10,2} + M_{11,3} & -M_{9,6} - M_{11,8} & M_{10,10} + M_{11,11} \end{bmatrix} \quad (40)$$

For the analyzed Bell state, (40) yields $\det(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(1)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = \det(M''_{\tilde{f}^{(2)}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} = -1/4$ clearly demonstrating the entanglement.

Thus, it is seen how new inseparability inequalities, corresponding to $\det(M'_{\tilde{f}}(\rho))_{\mathbf{r}} < 0$, can be obtained by application of positive maps to matrices of moments.

VI. DETECTION OF BOUND ENTANGLEMENT OF FINITE-DIMENSIONAL STATES THROUGH ANALYSIS OF MOMENTS

The original SV criterion is based on partial transposition, thus it cannot reveal PPT bound entanglement. On the other hand, it is known that the standard realignment criterion applied directly to the density matrix can detect entanglement of some bound entangled states [20, 21, 22, 23, 24]. A question arises: can PPT bound entanglement be detected by our realignment-based generalized criterion? We have tested numerically some bound entangled states of dimensions 3×3 [34, 35], 2×4 [34], $d \times d$ [36, 37] as well as infinite [16, 17], but we have not been able to detect entanglement by our generalized criterion.

All numerical simulations suggest that the norms of reordered $M_{\tilde{f}}$ satisfy the inequality $\nu^\Gamma_{\tilde{f}} \geq \nu^R_{\tilde{f}}$ or, equivalently, $||(M_{\tilde{f}})^\Gamma|| \geq ||(M_{\tilde{f}})^R||$. If this observation is true in general, then the described realignment-based criterion is useless in detecting PPT bound entanglement. Nevertheless, bound entanglement can be detected via moments with the help of the formula (see, e.g.,[38]):

$$\langle m_1|\rho|m_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m_1!m_2!}} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^j}{j!} \langle (a^\dagger)^{m_2+j} a^{m_1+j}\rangle, \quad (41)$$

which enables calculation of a given density matrix from moments of creation and annihilation operators. It is worth noting two properties: (i) The above sum is finite for finite-dimensional states (ii) Eq. (41) is not convergent for some states of the radiation field including thermal field with mean photon number ≥ 1. The formula readily generalizes for two-mode fields as

$$\langle m_1, n_1|\rho|m_2, n_2\rangle = \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\langle (a^\dagger)^{m_2+j} a^{m_1+j} (b^\dagger)^{n_2+k} b^{n_1+k}\rangle}{(-1)^{j+k} j!k!\sqrt{m_1!n_1!m_2!n_2!}}. \quad (42)$$

Let us analyze a special case of (42) for two qubits. Single-qubit annihilation operator is simply the Pauli operator given by $a = \sigma^- = [0, 1; 0, 0]$, which implies that there are only four nonzero terms in sum (42). We can explicitly write two-qubit density in terms of the moments as follows:

$$\rho = \begin{bmatrix} \langle \overline{N}_a \overline{N}_b\rangle & \langle \overline{N}_a b^\dagger\rangle, & \langle a^\dagger \overline{N}_b\rangle, & \langle a^\dagger b^\dagger\rangle \\ \langle \overline{N}_a b\rangle, & \langle \overline{N}_a N_b\rangle, & \langle a^\dagger b\rangle, & \langle a^\dagger N_b\rangle \\ \langle a\overline{N}_b\rangle, & \langle ab^\dagger\rangle, & \langle N_a \overline{N}_b\rangle, & \langle N_a b^\dagger\rangle \\ \langle ab\rangle, & \langle aN_b\rangle, & \langle N_a b\rangle, & \langle N_a N_b\rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (43)$$

where $\overline{N}_a = 1 - N_a$ and $\overline{N}_b = 1 - N_b$. Matrix (43) can be partially transposed and realigned. All principal minors of ρ^Γ are positive if and only if ρ is separable. The above simple example for 2×2 system was given to show the method only. To detect bound entanglement, one has to analyze at least 2×4 or 3×3 systems. For brevity, we will not present explicitly density matrices in terms of moments for these systems. Nevertheless, they can easily be constructed using (42) and then realigned, according to (10), to detect entanglement of some bound entangled states [20, 21, 22]. Finally, let us remark that there are drawbacks of the method: (i) it works if we know the dimension $d < \infty$ of a given state. (ii) Usually, it is simpler to directly reconstruct density matrix rather than to reconstruct it via moments.

VII. A SIMPLE CONSTRUCTION OF MULTIMODE UNCERTAINTY-RELATION ENTANGLEMENT CRITERIA

The two-mode SV criterion can readily be applied in the analysis of bipartite-entanglement of m-modes. For this purpose, one can define an m-mode normally-ordered operator

$$f \equiv f(\{a_i\}) = \sum_{\{n_i\}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\{m_i\}=0}^{\infty} c(\{n_i, m_i\}) \prod_{i=1}^{m} (a_i^{n_i})^\dagger a_i^{m_i}, \tag{44}$$

where for brevity we denote $\{n_i\} \equiv \{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_m\}$, and similarly other expressions in curly brackets. As in the proof of Lemma 1, we have that an operator X is positive semidefinite if and only if $\mathrm{Tr}\{X f^\dagger f\} \geq 0$ for every f as in (44). To analyze how mode a_j is entangled to all the other modes, it is enough to identify, in the reasoning followed in the previous sections, system A with the mode j and system B with all the other modes. Therefore we take $a = a_j$, while normally-ordered powers $b^{\dagger l_1} b^{l_2}$ are substituted by normally-ordered powers

$$a_1^{\dagger (k_1)_1} a_1^{(k_1)_2} \ldots a_{j-1}^{\dagger (k_{j-1})_1} a_{j-1}^{(k_{j-1})_2} \\ a_{j+1}^{\dagger (k_{j+1})_1} a_{j+1}^{(k_{j+1})_2} \ldots a_m^{\dagger (k_m)_1} a_m^{(k_m)_2}.$$

As in the two-mode setting, we may (and we will) analyze positivity of an operator X with respect to a restricted class of operators f, more specifically with only some coefficients $c(\{n_i, m_i\})$ that do not vanish. This corresponds to testing positivity of principal submatrices.

For example, we show that (9) implies the three-mode Hillery-Zubairy criterion [12] originally derived from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. By choosing $f = (1, abc)$ (we use the notation introduced in Section III), one gets $M_f(\rho^\Gamma) = \left[1, \langle a^\dagger bc\rangle; \langle ab^\dagger c^\dagger\rangle, \langle N_a N_b N_c\rangle\right]$, where $N_c = c^\dagger c$ and, analogously, N_a and N_b are the number operators. Imposing negativity of the determinant, one derives

$$\langle N_a N_b N_c\rangle < |\langle a^\dagger bc\rangle|^2, \tag{45}$$

which is the desired Hillery-Zubairy criterion [12], i.e., a sufficient condition for the state to be entangled. By restricting the above case to two modes (say $c = 1$), one can choose $f = (1, ab)$, which leads the Hillery-Zubairy two-mode entanglement condition [12], given by (22), as already shown in [4]. By choosing a different function f, one can obtain new Hillery-Zubairy-type three-mode criteria. For example, let us choose $f = (a, bc)$ then $M_f(\rho^\Gamma) = [\langle N_a\rangle, \langle abc\rangle; \langle abc\rangle^*, \langle N_b N_c\rangle]$, which results in a sufficient condition for the three-mode entanglement:

$$\langle N_a\rangle \langle N_b N_c\rangle < |\langle abc\rangle|^2. \tag{46}$$

In a special case, (46) is reduced to another two-mode entanglement condition of Hillery and Zubairy: $\langle N_a\rangle\langle N_b\rangle < |\langle ab\rangle|^2$, derived from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality in [12].

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied inseparability criteria of bipartite quantum states given in terms of the matrices of observable moments of creation and annihilation operators, generalizing the analysis by Shchukin and Vogel. We have proposed a new criterion based on realignment of elements of the moment matrices of special symmetry (i.e., corresponding to tensor product $\tilde{f}$s), as a generalization of the Rudolph-Chen-Wu realignment criterion applied for density matrices. Another reordering of elements of the moment matrices corresponds to the partial transposition as in the original SV criterion. We have proposed another criterion based on positive maps applied to appropriate submatrices of moments. Unfortunately, we have neither analytical nor numerical evidence that the new realignment-based and positive-map criteria can be more sensitive than the PPT criterion for some states. To detect (bound) entanglement by measuring moments of creation and annihilation operators, we have applied another method based on a formula for expressing density matrices in terms of the moments and then by applying the standard realignment criterion. We have discussed applications of the SV criteria to describe bipartite-entanglement of more than two modes. In particular, we have obtained the three-mode Hillery-Zubairy criteria originally derived from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and derived new ones of the same type.

Even if, in all the examples we studied, we have that partial transposition is the most sensitive and efficient (in terms of the dimensions of the submatrix of moments to be handled) entanglement criterion, the possibility that the other criteria we introduced (either realignment- or positive map-based) are in some cases more efficient, is still open.

As regards the quantification of "how entangled" or "how far from being separable" a state is, it is difficult to provide estimates based on the violation of the criteria presented. Not only the conditions are not linear (they involve eigenvalues of matrices built out of moments), but the moments themselves are in principle not continuous, since creation and annihilation operators are unbound operators. Yet, if a state is detected as entangled (within experimental error), there is an "entangled ball" around it, and small (with "how small" unfortunately not quantified) changes do not spoil entanglement. Continuity could be recovered imposing suitable (and physically sensible) conditions on the admissable states, as done in [14]. These points will be addressed elsewhere.

Finally, it is intriguing that we have not been able to detect bound entanglement by our new criteria. It seems to be a feature, which is connected intimately with the structure of the map from density operators to matrices of moments. A state is separable if and only if the corresponding matrix of moments is separable in terms of local physical matrices of moments. But not all positive matrices can be interpreted as physical matrices of moments. So, while a PPT entangled state for sure corresponds to a (positive) matrix of moments that is not separable in terms of local physical matrices of moments, it may happen that the matrix is separable in terms of plain positive matrices. Unfortunately, the methods we adopted refer to the concept of separability as studied for states, i.e., they are not able to distinguish between the two kinds of separability. Notice that such ambiguity never arises for NPT states, which correspond to NPT (hence inseparable in either ways) matrices of moments. It then appears that a more detailed study of the mapping from states to moments may shed new light on the structure of bound entanglement itself.

Note added. After completion of the first version of our paper, the SV criterion was thoroughly applied to the multipartite CV case in [43].

Acknowledgments. We would like to thank Michał Horodecki for useful comments and observations, and for reading an early version of the manuscript. We also thank Jens Eisert, Otfried Gühne, Karol Horodecki, Adam Majewski and Karol Życzkowski for comments. This work was supported by grant PBZ MIN 008/P03/2003, EU grants RESQ (IST 2001 37559), QUPRODIS (IST 2001 38877) and EC IP SCALA. AM was also supported by grant 1 P03B 064 28 of the Polish State Committee for Scientific Research. MP was also supported by NATO-CNR Advanced Fellowship.

[1] S. L. Braunstein and A. K. Pati (eds.), *Quantum Information Theory with Continuous Variables* (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2003).
[2] S. L. Braunstein and P. van Loock, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 513 (2005).
[3] V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, Phys.Rev. A **57**, 1619 (1998).
[4] E. Shchukin and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 230502 (2005).
[5] A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1413 (1996).
[6] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **223**, 1 (1996).
[7] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2726 (2000).
[8] L.-M. Duan, G. Giedke, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2722 (2000).
[9] S. Mancini, V. Giovannetti, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 120401 (2002).
[10] M. G. Raymer, A. C. Funk, B. C. Sanders, and H. de Guise, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 052104 (2003).
[11] G. S. Agarwal and A. Biswas, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **7** 350 (2005).
[12] M. Hillery and M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 050503 (2006).
[13] E. V. Shchukin and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 043808 (2005).
[14] J. Eisert, Ch. Simon and M. B. Plenio, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **35**, 3911 (2002).
[15] V. Giovannetti, S. Mancini, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 022320 (2003); M. M. Wolf, G. Giedke, O. Kruger, R. F. Werner, J. I. Cirac, *ibid.* **69**, 052320 (2004); G. S. Agarwal and A. Biswas, New J. Phys. **7**, 211 (2005); A. Serafini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 110402 (2006); P. Hyllus and J. Eisert, New J. Phys. **8**, 51 (2006); O. Gühne and N. Lütkenhaus, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 170502 (2006); H. Nha and J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 012317 (2006).
[16] P. Horodecki and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2657 (2000).
[17] R. F. Werner and M. M. Wolf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3658 (2001).
[18] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, in: *Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments*, edited by G. Alber *et al.* (Springer, Berlin, 2001), p. 151.
[19] I. Bengtsson and K. Życzkowski, *Geometry of Quantum States: An Introduction to Quantum Entanglement* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).
[20] O. Rudolph, e-print quant-ph/0202121; Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032312 (2003)
[21] K. Chen and L. A. Wu, Quantum Inf. Comput. **3**, 193 (2003).
[22] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **13**, 103 (2006).
[23] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **219**, 1 (2003).
[24] P. Wocjan and M. Horodecki, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **12**, 331 (2005).
[25] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5239 (1998).
[26] P. Horodecki, J.I. Cirac, and M. Lewenstein, in [1]; quant-ph/0103076.
[27] A. Miranowicz and M. Piani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 058901 (2006).
[28] G. Strang, *Linear Algebra and Its Applications* (Academic Press, New York, 1980).
[29] K. Hammerer, M. M. Wolf, E. S. Polzik, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 150503 (2005).
[30] A. Kossakowski, Open Syst. Inf. Dyn. **10**, 1 (2003).
[31] K. C. Ha, Linear Alg. Appl. **359**, 277 (2003).
[32] H. -P. Breuer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 080501 (2006).
[33] W. Hall, e-print quant-ph/0607035.
[34] P. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A **232**, 333 (1997).
[35] C. H. Bennett *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5385 (1999).
[36] P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1056 (1999).
[37] M. Piani and C. Mora, e-print quant-ph/0607061.
[38] A. Wünsche, Quantum Opt. **2**, 453 (1990).
[39] M.-D. Choi, Linear Alg. Appl. **10**, 285 (1975).
[40] N. J. Cerf and C. Adami, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 5194 (1997).
[41] M. Horodecki and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4206 (1999).
[42] E. Størmer, Proc. Am. Math. Soc. **86**, 402 (1982).
[43] E. Shchukin and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 030302(R) (2006).
[44] It must be remarked that the existence of bound entangled states with non-positive partial transposition is still an open question.
[45] We remark that the introduced bases do not correspond to a Fock representation, nor are directly related to it.
[46] A linear map Λ is positive if it preserves positivity of every matrix on which it acts: $X \geq 0 \Rightarrow \Lambda[X] \geq 0$. It

is moreover completely positive if it preserves positivity of all matrices on which it acts partially: $X_{AB} \geq 0 \Rightarrow (\mathrm{id}_A \otimes \Lambda_B)[X_{AB}] \geq 0$.

[47] A map is decomposable if it can be written as $\Lambda = \Lambda_1^{CP} + \Lambda_2^{CP} \circ T$, where $\circ$ stands for composition, T for the transposition operation and Λ_i^{CP}, $i = 1, 2$ are completely positive maps, which by definition cannot detect any entangled state if applied partially. A decomposable map cannot detect the entanglement of a PPT state.

[48] Actually, it corresponds to the reduction map $\Lambda[A] = \mathbb{1}\mathrm{Tr}A - A$ discussed in Refs. [40, 41].